
Serial No. 09/801,589

David H. Evans

Page 19 of 21**Section IV:****AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121****REMARKS****Telephone Interview Request**

Prior to issuance of the next Office Action and following consideration of the amendment and remarks made herein, applicant's agent requests to hold a telephone interview the Examiner in order to answer any questions the examiner may have and to consider any changes the examiner may have to suggest.

Objections to the Specification

In the Office Action, the examiner has objected to several instances of the misspelling of the acronym "JPDA" as "JDPA". This amendment corrects those misspellings. A separate sheet containing a replacement ABSTRACT is also included with this reply.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected all pending claims as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,901,315 to Edwards (hereinafter "Edwards") in view of "Java Platform Debugger Architecture - Documentation JPDA 1.0" (hereinafter SUNJPDA), or in view of "Java 2 Platform, Standard Edition, v.1.3.1 API Specification, Index B, G, I, O" (hereinafter SUNJ2SEAPI).

However, neither Edwards, SUNJPDA, nor SUNJ2SEAPI disclose *how* to connect the JVM to the probe program, nor how to launch the application in the manner we have disclosed and claimed:

- (a) launch a JVM;
- (b) use a JPDA bootstrap object to obtain a JPDA Virtual Machine Manager;
- (c) access a list of connectors from said Virtual Machine Manager;
- (d) connect the probe program to the JVM by:
 - (1) iterating through said list of connectors and

Serial No. 09/801,589

David H. Evans

Page 20 of 21

- (2) storing a command line launch object as a connector object;
- (e) executing an application program for debug and test under the JVM by:
 - (1) setting a main argument for the connector object to the name of said application program,
 - (2) setting a suspend argument for the connector object to true,
 - (3) invoking a launch method which returns a Virtual Machine (VM) object to the probe program,
 - (4) creating one or more exception requests for suspending the application program when an exception event occurs,
 - (5) creating a notification request for loading of classes and thread deaths,
 - (6) reading a list of loaded classes, and
 - (7) spawning a thread which enters an event retrieval loop.

Details of these steps of our process are set forth in our figures and our disclosure, especially at page 14, line 5, through page 16, line 12. As the proposed combinations fail to teach these steps or elements of our claimed invention, the rejections should be withdrawn in view of the amendment and our claims should be allowed. MPEP §2143.03 states:

All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

The facts derived from the references and set forth above indicate that the suggested combinations and modifications of the cited references do not teach all claimed elements, limitations or step. Therefore, the rejections of the independent claims are unsupported by the cited art. The dependent claims are also patentably distinct from the cited art, as well.

Serial No. 09/801,589

David H. Evans

Page 21 of 21**Conclusion**

It has been established that the rejections are not supported by the cited art in view of the amendment made herein and our original disclosure. The examiner's objections have been considered, and have been accommodated by the amendment made herein. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of the claims as amended.

###